

# EXHIBIT C

**From:** [Michael Shore](#)  
**To:** [Cohen, Justin S \(DFW - X61211\)](#)  
**Cc:** [STPurdueHKService](#); [Team-Purdue-ST](#); [John Lahad](#); [Brian Melton](#); [Halima Shukri Ndai](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Purdue v. ST - draft dismissal of the '112 Patent  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:47:56 PM

---

*[External email]*

Since when has ST been worried about efficiency?

Let me think about it and consult with my co-counsel. We will get back to you by Friday.

---

**From:** Cohen, Justin S (DFW - X61211) <[Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com](mailto:Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:42 PM  
**To:** Michael Shore <[mshore@shorefirm.com](mailto:mshore@shorefirm.com)>  
**Cc:** STPurdueHKService <[STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com](mailto:STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com)>; Team-Purdue-ST <[Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com](mailto:Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com)>; John Lahad <[jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com](mailto:jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com)>; Brian Melton <[BMelton@SusmanGodfrey.com](mailto:BMelton@SusmanGodfrey.com)>; Halima Shukri Ndai <[hndai@shorefirm.com](mailto:hndai@shorefirm.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Purdue v. ST - draft dismissal of the '112 Patent

**CAUTION: External Email!**

Thanks Michael - Purdue's operative pleading asserts infringement of the '112 patent. Similarly, ST is asserting counterclaims directed to the '112 patent. We think the most efficient path is a stipulation of dismissal of all '112 patent claims and counterclaims.

**Justin S. Cohen | Holland & Knight**

Direct 214.969.1211 | Cell 214.605.1993

[Add to address book](#) | [View professional biography](#)

---

**From:** Michael Shore <[mshore@shorefirm.com](mailto:mshore@shorefirm.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:38 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Justin S (DFW - X61211) <[Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com](mailto:Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com)>  
**Cc:** STPurdueHKService <[STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com](mailto:STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com)>; Team-Purdue-ST <[Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com](mailto:Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com)>; John Lahad <[jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com](mailto:jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com)>; Brian Melton <[BMelton@SusmanGodfrey.com](mailto:BMelton@SusmanGodfrey.com)>; Halima Shukri Ndai <[hndai@shorefirm.com](mailto:hndai@shorefirm.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Purdue v. ST - draft dismissal of the '112 Patent

*[External email]*

This is unnecessary. If you think otherwise, please state why. We are not going to be asserting any of the claims from the '112 patent going forward. I just want to understand why you think this is somehow required.

---

**From:** Cohen, Justin S (DFW - X61211) <[Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com](mailto:Justin.Cohen@hklaw.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:32 PM  
**To:** Michael Shore <[mshore@shorefirm.com](mailto:mshore@shorefirm.com)>  
**Cc:** STPurdueHKService <[STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com](mailto:STPurdueHKService@hklaw.com)>; Team-Purdue-ST <[Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com](mailto:Team-Purdue-ST@shorechan.com)>; John Lahad <[jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com](mailto:jlahad@SusmanGodfrey.com)>; Brian Melton